



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/658,393	09/08/2000	Kathrin Berkner	074451.P110	3421	
7590 03/30/2006			EXAMINER		
Michael J Mallie			LEE, TOMMY D		
Blakely Sokolo	off Taylor & Zafman LL	P		_	
Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
12400 Wilshire Boulevard			2625		
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/658,393	BERKNER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Thomas D. Lee	2625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP			
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, affitice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the contract of the	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
<ul> <li>3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading a final rejection in set appears.</li> <li>(b) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a final rejection.</li> <li>(d) Represent additional claims without canceling a final rejection.</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below);	
<ul> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	·	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9,38-47,84-86 and 119-123. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a l).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see ATTACHMENT.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
13.		Shake.	2
		Thomas D Lee	

Primary Examiner Technology Division 2625

Application/Control Number: 09/658,393 Page 2

Art Unit: 2625

## **ATTACHMENT**

1. Regarding Item no. 3, the proposed amendments to base claims 1, 39, 119 and 120 raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The claims now recite the sharpening or smoothing of *text and image regions* of image data corresponding to an input image in a wavelet domain, which was not previously recited.

2. Regarding Item no. 11, applicant's arguments in response to the prior rejection of claims 84-86 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) (see pages 7 and 8 of current amendment) are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant asserts that the cited reference (U.S. Patent 5,497,777 (Abdel-Malek)) merely processes wavelet coefficients to reconstruct the image after speckle noise has been removed, and thus fails to describe or suggest further processing image coefficient data after the threshold processor and before the inverse wavelet transform, i.e., fails to describe or suggest "rescaling coefficients by filtering coefficients after thresholding." However, as set forth in the prior Office action mailed December 9, 2005 (see *Response to Arguments*, on page 2), rescaling, as disclosed in applicant's specification, at page 23, lines 12-13, corresponds to multiplication of coefficients by a multiplication factor. In Abdel-Malek, each coefficient is multiplied by a multiplication factor (column 6, lines 25-35), thereby providing a rescaling of the coefficients.

As for the remaining claims, applicant's arguments (see pages 8-14 of current amendment) are not considered because such arguments are based on the claims as amended to overcome the prior rejections. As mentioned above, the amendments to

Art Unit: 2625

the claims will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas D. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7436. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-5:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas D Lee

**Primary Examiner** 

**Technology Division 2625** 

tdl

March 24, 2006